

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-12 and 16-19 are pending in this application. Claims 7-12 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,622,266 to Goddard et al. (herein "Goddard") in view of U.S. patent 7,031,009 to McCarthy, Jr. (herein "McCarthy"). That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Each of independent claims 7, 10 and 16 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims clarify an operation noted in the present specification for example at Figures 10, 11A and for example at page 7, line 9 *et seq.*. As shown in these Figures, in an image processing apparatus and method, a job completion condition can be reported to a user terminal. Further, a thumbnail image data generating device can generate thumbnail image data of a first page of the job, which is then stored in an information source provided in the image processing apparatus. When the job is completed, then an electronic mail transmitting device transmits an electronic mail including a URL representing the image processing apparatus, the electronic mail being transmitted to a mail address of the user terminal apparatus having requested the job, without transmitting the generated thumbnail image data.

With such an operation, the user at the user terminal apparatus can then access the thumbnail image data at the information source by utilizing the transmitted URL of the information source, to thereby obtain the thumbnail image data.

In the claims as currently written, the URL of the image processing apparatus, for example a digital copier, storing the generated thumbnail image data can be sent without the generated thumbnail image data, so that the user at the terminal apparatus can then obtain and display the thumbnail of the image data from the image forming apparatus itself.

The features clarified in each of independent claims 7, 10, and 16 are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

Each of independent claims 7, 10, and 16 now clarifies the transmission of an electronic mail message including a URL when a job has been completed. That feature is believed to distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding rejection cites as a primary reference Goddard to disclose transmission of an electronic mail, noting element 216 of Figure 2 showing notifications by an electronic mail.

In reply to that grounds for the rejection, applicant notes each of the notifications 216 in Goddard is directed to providing a notification of an *error* in an image forming operation. None of the noted notifications in Goddard is directed to providing an indication that a job has been *completed*.

Further, applicants submit McCarthy also does not disclose or suggest providing an electronic mail including a URL as an indication of a job being completed. McCarthy discloses a metadata acquisition service 26 that can send an e-mail, apparently to solicit metadata to be added to a scanned document, to create a file stored in a repository. In that respect McCarthy also differs from the claims as written as in McCarthy the jobs for which an e-mail is sent are not jobs that have been successfully completed when the e-mails are sent.

In contrast to Goddard and McCarthy, in the claims as written the electronic mail including the URL is sent when a job has been completed. Neither Goddard nor McCarthy disclose or suggest such features.

Moreover, as clarified in the claims the URL sent with the electronic mail represents “the image processing apparatus, the electronic mail being transmitted to a mail address of the user terminal apparatus having requested the job, when the job is completed”. According to such a claimed feature, for example if the image processing apparatus is a digital copier, when a job has been completed an electronic mail is sent that includes a URL of the digital

copier itself. A user can then utilize that URL to access data stored in the digital copier.

Further, that URL is sent to the job requester that requested the job.

With such a claimed operation, the job requester can remotely recognize completion of the job previously requested, and the job requester can then approach the printer for the *first time* to collect a printed output. As the URL indicates the image processing apparatus having actually completed the job, the URL can specify the location of the image processing apparatus to the job requester so that the job requester can easily identify that image processing apparatus, and thereby save time and effort in retrieving the completed job.

In contrast to the above-noted claimed features, in McCarthy a client would need to walk to both the scanner server 20 and the e-mail client 30 per file, and thus McCarthy cannot realize benefits as in the claimed invention noted above.

Further, in Goddard an e-mail is sent to a predetermined client in charge, who may be different from the job requester client, and thus Goddard does not disclose sending the URL to the user terminal that requested the job.

One basis for maintaining the outstanding rejection indicates that the document metadata of McCarthy includes a URL to the first page of the scanned document [col. 2, ll. 38-39]”.¹ In reply to that grounds for rejection applicant notes the claims as clarified herein recite the URL represents the image processing apparatus performing the job, not the scanned document itself.

Applicant also points out in addition to sending a URL of the first page of the scanned document, McCarthy discloses sending the first page of the scanned document as an e-mail attachment, which applicant submits teaches away from the claimed features, further providing evidence of the differences between McCarthy and the claimed invention.

¹ Office Action of July 30, 2008, page 9, lines 3-4.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicant respectfully submits each of amended independent claims 7, 10, and 16 as currently written, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Goddard in view of McCarthy, and thus each of the claims as currently written is believed to be allowable over Goddard in view of McCarthy.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\244226\244226US-AM1.DOC

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423